

LONG RANGE PLANNING

TO: Plan Review Steering Committee
FROM: Long Range Planning Staff
DATE: April 16, 2003
SUBJECT: Summary Notes from the GMA Steering Committee meeting of
April 16, 2003 (Meeting #3332)

Attendance:

Steering Committee Members:

Jay Cervený	City of La Center Council Member
Elizabeth Cervený	City of La Center Mayor
Jeanne Harris	City of Vancouver Council Member
Michael Hefflin	City of Ridgefield Council Member
John Idsinga	City of Battle Ground Mayor
Mary Kufelt-Antle	City of Camas Council Member
Betty Sue Morris	Clark County Board of Commissioners
Craig Pridemore	Clark County Board of Commissioners (Chair)
Judie Stanton	Clark County Board of Commissioners
Jeannie Stewart	City of Vancouver Council Member

Public:

Marnie Allen	Consortium of Clark County Schools
Ken Hadley	Self
James Howsley	Lane Powell Spears Lubersky
Laura Hudson	Dean Evans & Associates
Dean Lookingbill	RTC
John McConaughy	WSDOT, SW Region
Ken Navidi	Hazel Dell Sewer District
Don & Candy Payne	Selves
Gillian Zacharias	Dean Evans & Associates
Members of the Clark County Youth Commission (no names were signed in)	

Staff:

Monty Anderson	City of Washougal Planning Director
Bill Barron	Clark County Administrator
Derek Chisholm	Clark County Long Range Planning
Eric Eisemann	Cities of La Center & Ridgefield

Lianne Forney	Clark County POI Director
Bob Higbie	Clark County Long Range Planning
Mary Keltz	Clark County Board of Commissioner's Office
Denny Kiggins	Hazel Dell Sewer District - Commissioner
Patrick Lee	Clark County Long Range Planning Manager
Rich Lowry	Clark County Chief Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
Dale Miller	C-TRAN
Oliver Orjiako	Clark County Long Range Planning
Dennis Osburn	City of Battle Ground
Marty Snell	City of Camas Planner
Bryan Snodgrass	City of Vancouver Planner
Josh Warner	Clark County Community Development

1. Introductions.

Pridemore called the meeting to order. Everyone present introduced themselves.

2. Review January 15 and February 19, 2003 meeting notes.

Notes approved without change.

3. Economic Development Presentation by the Youth Commission (Beth Houston and Youth Commission) (20 minutes).

Youth Commission presented on a 6-month study talking with peers about what economic development (e.d.) is to them. They are making a number of recommendations related to e.d. They presented a vision and goals. They conducted focus groups in local high schools to get a diversity of opinions. The views are also of the 23 members of the Commission. County government is an important part of e.d. Transportation is a key. Few youth use C-Tran because lack of routes and limited hours of operation. There is an imbalance between expense and convenience in youth. They are interested in light rail, but think county funding should be minimal. Need to seek private and federal funding. Zoning is a key issue for livability. They also feel that infrastructure needs to be planned more efficiently. As well as a need to maintain a strong tax base and support funding for projects that are desirable to residents. Also need to attract businesses to create a strong tax base.

Permitting: The permitting process needs to be expedited and simplified without compromising standards. All of this needs to be done by being fair. Protection of critical areas is also important.

Outreach: Youth want to be involved and create more outreach to students. This could be accomplished through school newspapers.

Defining Clark County: Youth see an advantage to fostering diversity in the community and investing in fine arts. There is also a need to define Clark County and keep it distinct

from Portland. They want to investigate a Clark County based news source. Public parks are also important.

Public Transportation: This is vital. Street level retail development of downtown areas should be encouraged. It encourages pedestrian use and reduced auto trips. Youth are interested in businesses that cater to them. Downtown Vancouver needs to be attractive to Portland residents.

Education: Quality schools are key to attracting professionals and family oriented workers. Need to try to decrease the costs of building school facilities with partnerships. Vocational programs should also be encouraged. WSU should have a 4-year program and this would attract many local students. Increasing the diversity of programs at WSU-V and Clark College.

Downtown Revitalization: Encourage foot traffic and youth spending. Recruit businesses to increase spending such as restaurants that are open late. Also want to look into the possibility of a theme or water park.

Industrial Development: See key as redevelopment before permitting new lands to be developed. Encourage building up and not out. Youth are interested in a variety of careers and would like a 4-year program in the area.

Corporate Investment in Education: A desire to encourage local companies to offer tuition assistant in exchange for working with the company as an intern or after training. This will bring people back to Clark County.

Ethnic Diversity: Clark County has a fairly homogenous population, but we should be welcoming to a diversity of people. This can be accomplished with big public events that invite different cultures. Corporations can also provide diversity.

"The Spot": A place set aside for students that they are members of and open to Clark County students. It would be best on the Columbia to provide access to the water. The rules would be similar to schools and enforced by hired security guards. This would also employ youth. The funding might partially come from restaurant franchises on the site. Currently many youth go to Portland for entertainment.

Helping Youth: Many youth have lower standards of living than other people. Budget cuts have had a great impact on programs directed toward these people. "Different-abled" people need to be accommodated in all walks of life. Funding is an important part of this. There should not be a 'them vs. us' mentality. Clark County has a large population of deaf people and interpreter training programs should be available locally.

Youth News: A monthly publication to inform youth about how they can become involved. A report was submitted along with this presentation.

4. Focused Public Investment Area (FPIA) Preliminary Report

Lee and Chisholm presented. There were 2 handouts. FPIA is a way to materially look at implementing investment and coordinate land use and capital improvements. This will

move some sites to a 'shovel ready' status. The first handout is an example of what work has been done to research each of the 17 nodes that were reviewed. The second handout is a preview of the FPIA report. The final report will lay out many of the costs individually so that one can look at them from many different perspectives. The ranking process will include the FPIA analysis and 'livability' factors. Some of these factors might include 'school district equity' another is consistency with the 50-year plan.

The report should be out by the end of the month. Kufelt-Antle asked about the ranking. Chisholm responded that it is a basic ranking for each item. Harris asked who does funding and planning. That is still up in the air. Assumptions are still being made about who will pay.

Chisholm said that TAC has been involved, but not in depth. They will be expected to review the report and comment. Pridemore said Hazel Dell redevelopment will be looked at and evaluation of the family-wage job vs. entry level jobs to give weight to the family-wage job. Return on public investment also needs to be reviewed. Hefflin asked about jobs being reviewed equally. This may be broken out in the report. Public vs. private. The report will be written in such a way as to be viewed from both views. This will give us ball-park figures.

5. Draft EIS – Introduction/Summary

Higbie presented. A handout was circulated. The Draft EIS was sent to all of the jurisdictions. The alternatives need to look at costs as well as the environmental impacts. The public comment period ends May 5th. Morris asked about Alternative 1. Higbie said it assumes 1.83 % increase. Higbie briefly reviewed the 5 alternatives and then the handout which is drawn from the Draft EIS.

An audience member asked if he can assume Alt. 1 is favored. Pridemore said that is not the case. It is still very open. The preferred alternative will likely be a combination of alternatives.

6. Timeline – Selection of a preferred Alternative. Completion of Comp Plan Update

Lee presented. Key dates are shown in calendar form in a handout. May 5 – comments on EIS. May 22 – organize comments to be shared with public. June 12 and 19 – planning commission and county commission hearings. June 23 – board public hearing. July 2 – begin refining CFP. July 29 and August 5 – public open house. Sept 25 – PC hearing. Last on Oct 16. BOCC – work-session November 5. Hearing before Thanksgiving.

7. TAC update.

No update

8. Next meeting date and time.

May 21st at PSC.

9. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 5:50

h:\long range planning\projects\cpt 99.003 five year update\cpt 99-003 - steering committee\minutes - steering\steering committee - April 16 2003 (#33).doc